



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
07/008,432	01/28/87	CHOATE	W TI-11782,122

ROBERT GROOVER
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P.O. BOX 225474, M/S 219
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER	
BARRON JR, G	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
222	4

DATE MAILED:

11/30/88

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A ~~shortened~~ statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 6 month(s), _____ day(s) from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449 | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152 |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474 | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-39 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-4, 20-24, 17, 37, 10, 30, 15 and 35 are rejected.
5. ☒ Claims 5-9, 11-14, 16, 18-19, 25-29, 31-34, 36 are objected to. and 38-39
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.
8. ☐ Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. These drawings are ☐ acceptable;
☐ not acceptable (see explanation).
10. ☐ The ☐ proposed drawing correction and/or the ☐ proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation). However, the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are corrected. Corrections MUST be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.
12. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

This document contains information that is UNCLASSIFIED
SECRETARY ORDER, as Being a 35 USC 181-188.
Unauthorized disclosure is subject to Civil
and Criminal Penalties.
EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 222

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gendreu or Rawicz.

The instant claims read on either Gendreu or Rawicz. Both references generate target model data, Gendreu with simulating circuit #17 and Rawicz with position computing apparatus #22. Both references collect actual flight path data, Gendreu with a radar, and Rawicz with sensor #10. Both generate an error measurement, Gendreu with tracking unit #5 and Rawicz with mixer #12. Both adjust the model data to reduce the error with loop feedback paths. Both calculate range, given at outputs of the model data generators.

3. Claims 17 and 37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Gendreu or Rawicz in view of Fukuhara et al.

The claimed invention differs from Gendreu and Rawicz in reciting generating initial model data. Fukuhara et al. teach a position measuring system which calculates a vehicle's position with initially estimated values inputted into a convergent computing section. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

682
11/28/88

Art Unit 222

art to provide initial model data with the systems of Gendreu or Rawicz to determine range in the shortest possible time as taught in Fukuhara et al.

4. Claims 10 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Gendreu or Rawicz in view of Newell et al.

The claims invention differs from Gendreu or Rawicz in the calculation of a perturbation model to reduce the error measurement in the systems. Newell et al. teach a target course predictor which includes a perturbation model to smooth or reduce error measurements caused by tracking irregularities. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the systems of Gendreu or Rawicz with means for smoothing or reducing error measurements with a perturbation model as taught in Newell et al.

5. Claims 15 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Gendreu or Rawicz in view of Golinsky.

667
11/24/88

These claims differ from Gendreu or Rawicz in the adjustment of flight path of the monitoring plane for optimizing the ranging performance of the system. Golinsky teaches a passive ranging system where the monitoring plane's speed is varied (or adjusted) to provide better ranging performance than a constant velocity path. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have adjusted the flight paths of monitoring plane as taught in Golinsky to improve ranging performance of tracking systems as in Gendreu or

Art Unit 222

Rawicz.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Libmon et al. relates to target course tracking using a least-means squares error measurement algorithm. Lubar relates to passive geometrical ranging systems. Virnot relates to vehicle guidance using a Kalman filter-type circuit generating state vectors of the vehicle.


7. Claims 5-9, 11-14, 16, 18-19, 25-29, 31-34, 36 and 38-39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. This communication is from the Examiner assigned to case, Gilberto Barron, Jr., whose telephone number is 703-557-4926.

GBJ.

Gilberto Barron, Jr.
11-23-88

GBJ:rg-25


THOMAS H. TARCZA
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 222